

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE ·	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/809,286	0:	3/25/2004	Chad Nelson	12477-016001	6038
26191	7590	12/04/2006	•	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.				WILSON, GREGORY A	
PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			•	3749	
				DATE MAILED: 12/04/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Sp
·	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/809,286	NELSON ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Gregory A. Wilson	3749
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	ppears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
Period for Reply  A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING II  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tired will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status .		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17	November 2006.	
	is action is non-final.	
Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	ance except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		·
4) ☐ Claim(s) 21-26 is/are pending in the applicating 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdress.  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 21-26 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac	cepted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received.  Its have been received in Applicationity documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D  5) Notice of Informal F  6) Other:	ate

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Prosecution on the merits of this application is reopened on claims 21-26 considered unpatentable for the reasons indicated below:

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henning et al (5,947,812). Henning discloses an air return bulkhead (22) having a peripheral portion adapted to abut a wall of a trailer (SEE Figure 15), a panel (side walls 130) coupled to and offset the peripheral portion to define a plenum (air flow cavity) between the panel and the and also aids in maintaining the panel a distance from the wall, a strap system (252, 256) which is inherently releasably securing the peripheral portion in abutment with the wall therefore securing the bulkhead to the wall such that the bulkhead can be removed without the use of tools; tapered sections containing the openings further act as a filter to prevent debris from entering the cavity (SEE column 3, lines 62-64) wherein the filter is part of the return plenum area (SEE Figure 5) where air

is drawn in and is slightly spaced from the lower edge of the panel. The airflow with is reduced as the flow moves from the lower portion of the bulkhead to the upper portion of the bulkhead as shown in Figures 10 and 16. Henning does not disclose that the bulkhead is secured to the wall in an elevated position above the floor of the trailer, however, the strap system of Henning provides structure capable of securing the bulkhead in an elevated position. Henning provides openings (34) which allow air to be drawn into the cavity. By having an elevated air return bulkhead, a larger flow of air is being provided wherein it is concluded that the entrainment of flow is a function of the cross-sectional area of the passage. This is recognized as a result effective variable, and would constitute an obvious design choice, since moving the bulkhead into a position to provide a larger volume of air would involve a mere rearrangement of the position of the bulkhead and involves only routine skill in the art. With regard to the applicants arguments that Henning does not teach "a lower panel portion that is wider than an upper panel portion such that the width of the plenum is greater proximal to the lower panel portion than the width of the plenum proximal to the upper panel portion" the examiner respectfully disagrees, since the applicant has not disclosed that having a bulkhead of this particular shape solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose that is unobvious to one having ordinary skill in the art and such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size/shape of the component which is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Application/Control Number: 10/809,286

Art Unit: 3749

Claims 23 & 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henning (5,947,812) in view of Manfred (EP 1099598A2). Henning et al discloses the applicants primary inventive concept as stated above but does not specifically recite hook members. Manfred teaches that it is known to provide a removable bulkhead with hooks (3, 4) (SEE Figure 1). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains to provide the bulkhead of Henning et al with the hook members, as taught by Manfred for the purpose of providing a removable bulkhead which can be removed and reinstalled without the use of handheld tools. With regard to the hooks members being downwardly facing, this is not considered a patentable limitation since it has been held that a mere reversal of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art.

## Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3749

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory A. Wilson whose telephone number is (571)272-4882. The examiner can normally be reached on 7 am - 4:30 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Josiah Cocks can be reached on (571) 272-4874. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Gregory A. Filan

November 29, 2006